1892
(L.R)

L.R. 84 of 1892.
Serial. No

(P-42)

Sub: Managa of Srirangapattana to act as Patel of Srirangapatana

L.R. File No. 84 of 1892

Subject. Manegar of Seringapatam to act as patel of Seringapatam.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Serial No.	Communication No.	Date.	From or to whom.	Subject in abstract.
1	1196	20-3-93	From D.C. Mysore.	Soliciting orders as to whether the Manegar of Seringapatam may be treated as Patel of Huradi.
2	Petition & Abstract	27-6-93	From Manegar of Seringapatam.	Praying that Podgi may be disbursed to him.
3	1226 / Pet-1180	24-1-94	Govt: Order.	Ordering the Manegar to be treated as Patel.
4	153	24-1-94	Endorsement to the Manegar.	Informing him that orders have been issued in the matter.
5	3156	30-4-94	From Venkatramaiya.	Requesting to be re-instated as Patel.
6	3 / P2	2-7-94	To D.C. Mysore.	Calling for the entire records of the case.
7	110	30-7-94	From -do-	Forwarding the records.
8	Office Precis with orders			
9	3156	3-11-94	End^{t} to Venkatramaiya	Stating that there are no grounds for altering the orders already passed.

Communicated
Asst.

File No.

Subject.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Serial No.	Communication No.	Date.	From or to whom.	Subject in abstract.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893 11342 APR 9 Pet 464

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 20th March 1893.

Despatched 29th.

Received

Enclosures No. File as per list.

General No.

No. 1196

Submitting the papers for order as to whether the present Monégar may be treated as Patél of Kura, Seringapatna Talúk, &c.

Peta Br. Mrk 7/4

order

under the circumstances stated in the present Monegar may be treated as Patel of the village & allowed to receive the Postage less the assessment of the Inam lands held by him.

2. Venkataramanah who was appointed Patel in 1892, under the erroneous impression that there was no claimant may be allowed the Postage up to ~~1893~~ date if he has done any duties connected with the office

8/4/93. [illegible] 1196

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—27-1-93.—5,000.

less the Beriz amount of the Inam land enjoyed by him as was done in the case of the shanboguc.

4. These petitions were forwarded to the Amildar for report who in reply stated that he had at first thought that the Monegar's duties were those of a shikdar and that consequently he had recommended that a separate person might be appointed for the Potéli; that on the perusal of Barabaliti register and on a consideration of the nature of the work performed by the Monejar which is almost the same as that of a Potél, he was inclined to look upon the Monejar as the Potél.

5. The Sub: Division officer submitted the whole proceedings for my orders, and on the present Amildar being called upon to submit further information, he reported (vide nos: 1,116 and 1,248) that one Mohamedan named Meralinsab was the Monejar formerly; that on his getting old and his son being found incompetent for the office, the petitioner's father Venkatésia was appointed to it; that after his death his son the petitioner was appointed to the office as per

Dy.

Deputy Superintendant's order No: 961 dated 22nd January 1872; that village Potels are called Muneejars in British Territories and that similarly the Potels of some parts of N. Arcotte Taluk are often called by that name. The Amildar further stated that the Muneejar's appointment was being entered in the Barabakti Register from the beginning; that the office of Potéli being hereditary and the present incumbent having succeeded his father and as the Inam land was duly confirmed in the Inam Settlement and has been in the enjoyment of his family for upwards of 30 years, he should be regarded as the hereditary Potél and that there was no necessity for making a separate appointment. He also suggested that the Potéji now allotted to the office might be paid to the Muneejar after deducting the Peria amount of the Inam land enjoyed by him as is done in the case of the Shanbogue. The Amildar also reports that Rs. 73 and 81, are the Potéji amounts fixed for the Shanbogue and the Potél respectively; that the market value of the Inam lands assigned

2/

to them is Rs. 300 and 250 per acre and that the moneyar still continues to perform the Poléli duties while the new Polél is virtually doing nothing. I have not been able to get at any references showing how the two appointments of shanbogue and moneyar were originally constituted and on what conditions the Inam lands were ~~assigned~~ to them. It is not clear how the moneyar's father succeeded a Muhamadan and whether under the circumstances the moneyar can be considered to hold the appointment by hereditary right.

6. I beg therefore to submit the papers for the orders of Government as to whether the present moneyar may be treated as Polél of the village and he may be allowed to enjoy the Inam lands which are valued at about 1,500 Rs. and recive the Polagi less the assessment fixed on the Inam lands.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

A Rangaswamy
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. N. 153 R
DATE 19-7-93

Seringapatam
27th June 1893

To

K. Seshadry Iyer Esquire
Dewan
Mysore

Most respected Sir.

The undersigned, with profound reverence, begs to bring the following to your honor's kind Consideration and for favourable orders.

1. When this town of Seringapatam was under the direct Control of the British Government, the Patail of this place, was styled the "Manégar" as in other parts of British India and his office is hereditary. The petitioner has been such a manégar of this place, from his father's time, that is, for about 30 years.

2. At the time of the survey settlement as this fact was not put forward, a separate individual who has no any right whatever was appointed as a patail and the Potakey is being to him.

3. The petitioner presented applications both to the Amildar and the Deputy Commissioner and the latter, the petitioner is come to know, has referred his claim to Government.

5. The petitioner is a man of a large family in poor circumstances and has been ~~of~~ doing Government duty Carefully and without — Complaint, and he prays that the Government may be pleased to pass orders, at an early date to the effect that the potakey money be given to him.

For this act of Kindness the petitioner ever ~~pet~~ prays for your honors long life and prosperity.

your humble petitioner begs
to remain
Most respected Sir
your honors most obedient servant

Manegar of
Seringapatam



(3)

Proceedings of the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:—

(1) Letter No 1196 dated 20th March 1893, from the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore, soliciting orders whether the Manegar of Seringapatam who, as such, has been doing the collection and other work usually done by Patels and enjoying certain service Inam lands, may be regarded as the Patel of the place and granted the Potagi allowance minus the assessment fixed on the Inam lands, and stating that in the belief that the office of Patel was newly created when Potagi was fixed for it at the Survey Settlement and that there was no

Hakdar

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. V 276.

From Pet 71

The Dy Commissioner Mysore dt

10

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Rec'd 20 Sep.
Issue notice to Plff & Defts
21/8/94

notice issued
11/8/94.

Dated 30/7/94

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file record

General No. 110
No.

Submits entire records in re Pateli of Seringapatam ——— ref^ce: Chief Secretary's no. 3/2 d/2^nd Instt.

5/8/94
11/8/94

Rec'd 2/8.

Hakdar entitled to hold it, one Venkatāramaiya was appointed as Patēl on the 16th July 1891, but that he is virtually doing nothing

(2) Petition No 153 of 1892-93 from the Manegar of Seringapatam.

Order thereon. No. 12226/Pet 1180 Dy 24-1-94/30.

Under the circumstances stated, the present Manegar may be treated as Patēl of the village, and allowed to receive the Potagi less the assessment of the Inam lands held by him.

2. Venkatāramaiya who was appointed Patēl in 1892, under the erroneous impression that there was no claimant, may be allowed

allowed the Potagi upto-
date, if he has done any
duties connected with the
office

Draft-
(Council order) 25/1

For Chief Secretary.

To
The Deputy Commr
Nyyore district with
records.

28/1/96

28/1/96

S.V.

No. 153

29-1-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

24/29 January 1894

Endorsement granted to the Manager of Seringapatam

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 153 dated 27.6.93

regarding the Patels of Seringapatam

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner to whom orders have been issued in the matter ~~who has been directed to bear Petitioner at the Patels of Seringapatam~~

23/1/94

24/1

"By Order"

Draft (Council order)

25/1

Chief Secretary.

14/1/94

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

Pet. 2520 relates to a separate subject altogether. Please put up the proper refe

11-5

References put up.
Rwd
25/5/94

Sir,
The three Proceedings Books are herewith submitted.
Rwd
1/6/94

Put up Case for hearing & give notice to Pr only Ct 28/6/94

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. 3156.

Name of Petitioner. Venkataramiah (son of Govindaffia). late Patel of Coora village, Srirangapatna Taluk.

Village.
Taluk. Bangalore
District.

Date of Arzi. 30-4-94.

Date of Receipt. 1-5-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Begs that justice may be done by granting him on of the following requests
1. To reinstate him in Patelki on payment of Potgi fixed for the office, or
2. To assess the inam, held by Ramaswamy Iyengar, to him in consolation of disappointment he experienced & subjected himself to sacrifices detailed in para 3 of the memorial, if Ramaswamy Iyengar cannot be ousted, or
3. At least sell the above inam to him so that he may purchase & benefit by that most yeilding spot,

as the granting of one of the above requests will not in any way affect Ramaswamy Iyengar, but will benefit both the Govt & the petitioner.

Subd to the Councillors for orders

This is an application for the review of the order passed on Pet. No 153 of 92-93, dated 24 January 1894. The Srirangapatna Amildar's indorsement, which is printed on page 1 of the Pet. but not produced, appears to have been despatched on the 31st March 94. This Pet. was received on the 1st May 94. Previous references are put up. Pet. 153 was presented by Sreenivasangar Monegar, while the present Pet. is filed by Venkataramiah.

R. J 4/6/94

Read & Dispose
Rwd 9/6

Notice to Venkataramiah (Pet) to call for records filed in this office 12226 & 24-1-94

Posted 19 July
R. C. 2814 of 1894

Pet 1180

2 Rs Stamp
Recd 1-5-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S O[illegible]
PETITION DEPART[illegible]
RECD. No. 3156 /C
DATE 1. 5. 94

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

The humble petition of Venkata Ramiah (son of ~~Govindappa~~) late Patel of Coora Village Seringapatam Taluk.

SHEWETH,

That your petitioner having received an order from the Amildar of Seringapatam Taluk (Copy of which has been inserted in the margin intimating the order of Government removing him from service on complaint of Ramaswamy Iyengar Coora Monegar, begs most respectfully to lay his humble case before your honor soliciting that the same may be subjected to a review as the whole matters have been misrepresented to cause the above exparte order.

ಚೆಪ್ರಿ ಸಿ ನಂಬರು 1140.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಕುರಾದ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಕೆಲಸ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವ ವೆಂಕಟ ರಾಮಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಹುಕುಂ—

ಈ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಕೆಲಸವು ಈಚೆಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಪೊಕ್ಕರರಾಗಿ ಇರುವ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಣೇಗಾರ್ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮೈಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರು ಫಿರ್ಯಾದುಮಾಡಿದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆವ ಳಿಕೆನಡಮು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ಬಗಿ ಮಣೇಗಾರ್ರನ್ನೇ ಪಟೇಲನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂತ ಗೌನ-ಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಇರುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹಾಲಿ ಪಟೇಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಪೊಕ್ಕರರಾಗಿ ಇರುವ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ ಕೆಲಸ ನೋಡಿದ ಕಾಲದ ಪೋಟಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವನನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಡೆಪ್ಟೇ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರ ವರ ಆರಡರ್ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಸಬ್ಡಿವೀರ್ಜ ಹುಜೂರಿಂದ 20—3—94ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಕಂ 1427ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಹುಕುಂ ಸಾದರಾಗಿ ಇರುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೀಖಿತ್ ಹುಕುಂ ನಿಸ್ಪಲಿರುವ ಪಟೇಲೀ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಭಾರ್ಜಾನ್ನು ಮಣೇಗಾರ್ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮೈಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲಸ ನೋಡಿದ ಕಾಲದ ಪೋಟಗಿ ನಿನಗೆ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಡುತ್ತೆ.

29ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 94. } (Sd.) ಬಿ. ಕೇಶವೈಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್,
31 } ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್.

2. That your petitioner humbly begs to convince your honor by the following points that Coora Monegar Ramaswamy Iyengar was only doing the duties of a Sheikdar (as had also been the case with all his predecessors and the want of Patel was considerately supplied by the petitioner's entertainment after the Settlement) and not of a Patel nor was he being acknowledged as such, that he himself cooperated in the nomination of a Patel, that he put up with his (Petitioner's) entertainment for a time and that for reasons and by encouragement and help he subsequently tried to acquire the office of Patel to evade the loss of inam and transfer from this place as he was subject to, and secure an additional income.

I. The following prove that Coora Monegar was and is no other than a Sheikdar;—

(*a*) Seperate "From" and "To" registers are kept in the Taluk Cutchery for Monegar as for Sheikdars of other Hoblies.

(*b*) Auction sales &c conducted by Sheikdars are conducted by the Monegar.

(*c*) Coora Shanbhogue corresponds with the Amildar through the Monegar as other Shanbhogues do in the Province through the Sheikdars.

(*d*) Revenue peons are given to Monegar as orderlies, which is the privelege of only Sheikdars and not of Patels.

(*e*) Coora Monegar is often addressed as Coora Hobli Sheikdar in orders issued by the Amildars from a long time, (vide Amildar Comarasamy Moodiliar's circular order No. 89 of November 1878, which the petitioner has well seen with the Monegar.)

(*f*) The post of Monegar is transferable as Sheikdari and not hereditary as that of a Patel, as Ramaswamy Iyengar's late father Venketa Iyengar a bramin was transferred from his post of a Cutwal to Monegari and succeeded one Sheik Ibrahim a Mahomedan, who had succeeded one Veerappah a Wukkuligar who had succeeded one Jukkanna a Curubar and so on.

II. The following prove that Ramaswamy Iyengar was not a Patel but a Sheikdar ;—

(a) Prior to the appointment of the petitioner the commission due to Patel on account of duty on arecanut was being brought to savings and paid to him after his entertainment. Monegar Ramaswamy Iyengar was in receipt of Sheikdar's share of Commission.

(b) Potgi was fixed to the Patel after the settlement and the amount was brought to savings until the date of the appointment of the petitioner. If Ramaswamy Iyengar had been the Patel he could have received the amount.

Note—A kind reference will prove both the above.

III. Coora Monegar Ramaswamy Iyengar has himself submitted a Mahazur to the Taluk Cutchery reporting that one Srecantia ought to be appointed a Patel, which proves his cooperation.

IV. Coora Monegar Ramaswamy Iyengar did not complain either when the appointment of a Patel was discussed for upwards of a year or until above a year after the petitioner was employed, but subsequently when Coora Hobli was contemplated to be added to an adjacent Hobli providing Ramaswamy Iyengar elsewhere he rose to petition that he himself was a Patel and while so a new man was appointed. Mr. Kristna Iyengar Amildar (of his sect) backed him and Mr. Rangaswmy Iyengar Deputy Commissioner supported him, without calling for the explanation of the petitioner or the Shanbhogue of the village.

Note—This sort of "making hay when the sun shines" is hereditory with Ramaswamy Iyengar. His late father Venkata Iyengar procured the post of Monegar when Mr. Annajee Iyengar had been an Amildar in 1868, when also the latter has mentioned the former's name as Venkatia in his Urzee to the Deputy Commissioner to screen the relationship. This also a reference proves.

3. That your petitioner depending upon his appointment and trying to deserve it fully in repayment of having secured an hereditary post, discontinued his study for Matriculation and Pleader's tests, spent a good sum to improve and repair his house which he would not do had he thought that it was but temporary having been ensured by the purport of his Sannud a copy of which has been inserted in the margin.

ಮುಲ್ಕಿ ನಂ. 387.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದಾ.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವೆಂಕಟಾಸ್ವೈಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಹುಕುಂ.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟ ಗಂಜಾಂ ಟವ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾದ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಿನಿಗೆ ಮೊಕರರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆಂದು ಫ್ರೆಂಚರಾಕ್ಸ್ ಸಬ್‌ಡಿವೀಜ್ ಹುಜೂರಿಂದಾ $\frac{219}{338}$ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಹುಕುಂ ಸಾದರತಾಗಿಧೆಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಟೇಲೀಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಮಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲಸ ಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೀನು ಹುಷಾರಿ ವಲಿಮಾನತ್ತು ದಾರಿಯಿಂದಾ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಬರುವದು ಈ ಟವ್ನಿಗಳ ಜನನ ಮರಣ ರಿಜಸ್ಟರುಗಳು ಮ್ಯೂನಸಿಪಲ್ ಮುತ್ಸದ್ದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿಧೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ನಿನ್ನ ಸುಫರ್ದಿಗೆ ತೆಗದುಕೊಂಡು ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಗುರ್ತೀ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಕಲುಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಬರಬೇಕು.

21/7/91. (Sd.) ಬಿ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀನಾರಣ್ಯಯ್ಯ,
ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್.

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

(6)

1894-5

From

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

To The Deputy Commr Kupgal Dt

Dated 2nd
Despatched 2nd } July 1894

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 3
P. No. 2

Calling for the entire records connected with the Potalee of Seringapatam.

[illegible] of the Govt.

JD.

The Dy: Commr.

Mysore.

Dated 2-7-94

Dispd. 2?

No 3 ✓
P.2

Has the honor to request that the entire records connected with the Patels of Seringapatam and returned to the Dy. Commr. with this office No. 12226 / Pet 1180 dated 24th January 1894, may be ~~returned~~ resubmitted to this by the 10th instant as a review application is pending hearing before Govt.

By order

2/1/94

Under Secretary.

Draft.

S.V.R.

To 2/7

J.

Send an urgent reminder that papers should reach us before 31st ~~28~~ July

2/7

2/7

Dispd 2/7.

During the
British administration,
the revenue of Lemnagalam
and Ganjam was collected
by 1/a Shanbog
& 2/a Monegar.

After the new division
they continued to do duties.

In 1891 at the
~~Pakka~~ Patige settlement,
873 and 81 were fixed
as remuneration for the
Shanbog & the Patel respectively
and one Venkataramaya
was appointed Patel.

Ramasamy Aiyangar,
Monegar, represented that
he was the Patel of Lemnagalam
that there was no necessity for
the appointment of a separate
Patel and prayed that the
remuneration fixed might
be given to him less the
assessment of the Monegar

Inam land held by him -

The Dy Comm
referred the matter for
orders of Govt and in doing
so said that Venkataramiah
was appointed at the Patrge
Settlement under the mistaken
impression that there was
no hereditary Patel, that
Patels are called Managars
in British territories, that
the Managarship was a
hereditary appointment,
that A Muhammadan who
was doing duties was named
as he was told, his son was
not appointed as he was
not competent, that Ramasamy
Iyengar's father was there appointed
and that Ramasamy Iyengar
succeeded him - The Dy
Comm was of opinion that
the Managar being treated
as the Patel (No 1 in the file)

The Govt approved
of the Dy Comm's proposal
and passed orders accordingly
(No 5 in the file)

Petition No 3156 of 1893-94.

Petitioner

Venkatarāmaiya
represented by
Mr. S. Ramaswami Iyer
Advocate.

Counter Petitioner

Ramaswami Iyengar

Notices served.

1 11. 94.

a a

G.T. 1/11

Precis of records submitted by the Dy. Commissioner Mysore District with his No. 1196 of 20th March 93 soliciting his sanction for the appointment of Manegar as Patel of Kasaba Seringapatam by removing the present incumbent lately nominated.

Kasaba Seringapatam is otherwise known as 'Kura', the meaning of which they say is an "island". Since the conquest of Seringpatam by the British in 1879 this island ~~this island~~ had been separated from the rest of the Province and kept under their direct administration till it was restored 6-4-4 the Maharaja during the rendition. As is still in vogue in some parts of the British Territories to call the Village Patels as Managers as this has obtained currency even in some of the Villages of T. Narsipur Taluk bordering on the territories and as the island had been under the direct management of the British they had appointed Manegar to perform the duties of a Patel and granted him land in inams for the service. Nothing had been known about the meaning of the term Manegar till recently.

In 1888-89 Survey Settlement of the Village was held and completed, when the Survey Department fixed the Potēl amounts for the offices of Chambogue and Potēl and directed that it should be disbursed to them by deducting from it the amount of Service Inam lands. This was accordingly given effect to in the case of Chambogue; but nothing was done in the case of ~~Chambogue~~ Inamdar as it was considered to be a separate appointment from that of the Potēl which having been considered to be not in Existence at all, required a new nomination.

On learning about this one Sreekantiah applied on the 6th August 90 to the Sub Division Officer French Rocks for this post. He forwarded it to Amildar with his No. 177/665 of 18 August 90 Enquiring whether there had been no Potēl for the Village and whether any steps were being taken to fill up the office and what was his opinion about the petitioner's request.

In reply the Amildar reported in his No 1003 of 18 December 90 that there had been no Potēl to the Village till then that in the Potēl Register received from the Survey Superintendent potēl amount of Rs. 81/- was fixed for the Potēl and consequently he Exercised it as his opinion that the nomination

and on the 10th idem the Amildar requested him to furnish reference showing the date on which the above records were despatched to the Dy. Commissioner.

On the 24th March 91 the Sub Division officer stated in reply that the reference was forthcoming in his office, that it was unnecessary to delay the Submission of his report on account of the above references, that the applicant, who would be benefited by these records might, if required, apply for and obtain copies of them from where they could be found and directed Amildar to expedite the report called for as applications were being received very frequently.

On the 20th May 91 the Amildar submitted with his No 144 the records and the statement called for.

Thereupon the Sub Division officer observed in his Proceedings No. 3390/18 Jul 91 that the appointment of a Potel was necessary but that it would be unnecessary to obtain the Sanction of Government therefor as the Potels amount had already been fixed, & that Sreekantiah referred to in the list recommended by him being a Brahmin could not be appointed as ordered by his predecessor and ordered that Venkata Ramiah the second in the list, being a Soodra born of a good family and qualified

every respect for the post was appointed that the appointment should be entered in the Barabalaki Register and work taken from him.

On the 2d March 92 Manager Ramiengar of Kura Kobli submitted a petition to the Dy. Collr. representing that he was in receipt of Proceedings No. 148/213 intimating the appointment of one Venkata Ramiah as Patel of the Village, that according to the 2d. Column of Vyavahara despite the duties of Manager and Patel are identical, that as Seringapatam had been under the British rule they had appointed Managers as Patel and Karnam as Shanbogue for the Village and entered in the Barabalaki Register allotting them inam lands for their services, that since the Survey Settlement in 1888-89 and since his father's appointment to the post for the last 25 years he had been satisfactorily performing the onerous duties of Collection, Subsidy &c., and praying that the services of the new Patel might be dispensed with and the Police amount of Rs. 81 might be ordered to be paid to him after deducting therefrom the Periz on his inam land amounting to Rs. 49. as has been done in the case of Shanbogue.

The petition having been unstamped and as the Endorsement of the Sub Divl. Officer did not accompany it was returned

Thereupon Ramaswamiengar submitted a petition on the same subject to the Sub Division Officer on the 12 March 92 and also a reminder petition of 28-3-92. They were forwarded to the Collector for report vide his No. 596 of 6-5-92

28-3-92

Hakdaris appointment or not, that of the appointment was not hereditary & his family it should be presumed that the appointment is not hereditary. Consequently it should be enquired how he got the appointment and if he possesses any records they should be obtained and forwarded.

This was referred to Amildar for report with his no. 956/692 of 22 Nov. 92.

Thereupon the Amildar reported in his nos 1116 and 1248 of 4 January & 7 Feby. 93 respectively that a Mohamedan named Ibrahim Sab was the Manegar formerly; that on his falling old and his son being found incompetent for the office, the petitioner's father Venkatesh was appointed to it; that after his death his son the petitioner was appointed to the office as per Dy. Superintendent's order no. 961 of 22 January 92; that the Village Potels are called Manegars in British Territories and that similarly the Potels of some parts of T. Narasipur Taluk are often called by that name. The Amildar further stated that the Manegars appointment was registered in the Barabalati Register from the beginning; that the office of Potel is hereditary and the present incumbent having succeeded his father and as the Inam land was duly confirmed in

the Inam Settlement and has been in the Enjoyment of his family for upwards of 30 years he should be regarded as the hereditary Potel and that there was no necessity for making a separate appointment. He also suggested that the Potels allowed to the office might be paid to the Manager after deducting the Sery amount of the Inam land enjoyed by him as is done in the case of the Chamboge. The Circar also reported that Rs. 73 and 81 are the Potels amounts fixed for the Chamboge and the Potel respectively that the market Value of the Inam lands assigned to them is Rs. 300 and 250 per acre and that the Manager still continues to perform the Potels duties while the new Potel is virtually doing nothing.

The Sub Division. Officer submitted the above records to the Dy. Commissioner with his No. 1202 of 14 Feby. 93.

The Dy. Commissioner in submitting the same to this office with his No. 1196 of 20 March 93 stated that he was not able to get at any references shewing how the two appointments of Chamboge and Manager were originally constituted and on what conditions the Inam lands were assigned to them. that it was not clear

hows the Inamdars father succeeded
a Mohamedan and whether under
the circumstances the Inamdar could
be considered to hold the appointment
by hereditary right and solicited in-
structions as to whether the present
Inamdar might be treated as Patel
of the Village and be allowed
to Enjoy the Inam Lands &c

20-11-94

No. 3156

(12)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

3rd Nov 1894

Endorsement granted to Venkatanarayana, late Patel of Coora, Lemugapatam

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 3156 dated 30.4.94

praying that ~~he may get~~ the orders of 26 January 94 ~~directing his removal from~~ the Patel's place may ~~be~~ reconsidered and that he may be reinstated in his appointment Petitioner is informed that

as the orders already passed are just and there are no grounds for altering them, ~~his petition has been rejected~~.

12226
in Proc Pet 1180
dt 24-1-94
30

3/11/94

No 7979/Pet: 719 dt 3/11/94

Copy to Collr
Enquiry &
for enquiry,
with the records
received with his letter
no 110 dated 30 July 1894.

Issued
U/14/11

"By Order"

14/11

Chief Secretary.

U/2/11

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.